



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Professor Meader's collections of material are very extensive and they appear to have been made with due regard to textual questions. At many points he has been able to correct the statements of the handbooks. For example, he shows (41 ff.) that the phrase *idem ipse* is Ciceronian.

The development of *idem* into an adverb (or conjunction, as Professor Meader prefers to call it) is cleared up by the new material presented on pages 101 ff. In an article in *Classical Philology* 2. 313-323, the present reviewer discussed such uses of *idem* as the following:

CIL. 6. 589. Cn. Antonius Cn. f. Fuscus aediculam cum ara et cratera d. d. *idemque* dedicavit.

CIL. 6. 15389. Claudia Cyprae fecit Claudius Felix libertae suae piissimae *idem* coniugi. . .

CIL. 14. 2112. L. Caesennio L. f. Quir. Rufo dict (atore) III *idemq(ue)* patr(ono). . .

In all of these inscriptions *idem* is employed to indicate the identity of a concept (in these cases, a person) which appears in two different situations. From the point of view of logic they are precisely parallel. From the point of view of grammar, however, they form a series which represents the historical development of *idem* from an inflected pronoun to an indeclinable element (adverb or conjunction). In the first sentence *idem* is in agreement with *Antonius Fuscus*, the name of the man whose identity in the two situations it predicates. In the second sentence *idem* is in agreement with *Claudius Felix*, while it predicates the identity of *Claudia Cyprae* in two situations (*libertae, coniugi*). In the third passage there is no word either expressed or implied with which *idem* can agree.

This simple and satisfactory account of the process was rejected in the article mentioned above because the material then at hand seemed to indicate that the second and third types belonged to two different local dialects. Professor Meader's new material shows that the simple explanation is probably the correct one.

Unfortunately, however, he fails to make the point quite clear; and for a reason that is characteristic, not of him alone, but of many of our psychological grammarians. He says (p. 99, footnote): "The general situation appears to me to be the most important factor that determines the 'meaning' of *idem*, the particular grammatical form into which they are cast appears secondary and less essential". In the case before us it is true that the general situation is the dynamic factor, the factor which induced the change. But the chief negative tendency, the chief barrier to the process was the grammatical rule of concord. Our three sentences show three successive stages in the breaking down of that barrier.

The ultimate object of grammatical study is not form or syntax or style but the linguistic consciousness which lies behind them all. But in every language the linguistic facts which are most prominent

in the minds of the speakers are just those which correspond with the grammatical categories of that language. The Latin system of concords is extremely complicated and unsatisfactory from the point of view of logic; one might perhaps think *a priori* that no such system could long hold a dominant place in the consciousness of any people. But we have before us proof that as a matter of fact it did for a long time prevail over the apparently more vital fact of parallelism in "the general situation". The reason is obvious; concord was a matter to which every speaker had to pay constant attention. Long habit compelled him to associate nominatives with nominatives, feminines with feminines, etc. The result of this and the many similar habits is that the grammatical categories represent the most important linguistic association-groups. We grammarians must not neglect them.

In other parts of his book also Professor Meader's enthusiasm for the new has led him to undervalue the old. On page 47 he takes Wagnon to task for "thinking of a word as having a meaning of its own apart from the context in which it stands; and not regarding it as a function, so to speak, of the unit of thought of which it forms a part". Now, a word really has "a meaning of its own". While its force is no doubt largely determined by the context in which it stands, its contribution to that context is no less important. The old-fashioned lexical treatment of words is justified by scientific considerations as well as by convenience.

It is well to remember that the method of philology—including grammar—is older and more highly perfected than any other method known to science. We ought to supplement it from every possible source, but there is very little of it that can safely be discarded.

Printer's errors are far too numerous in the book; there are no less than five in three lines of Latin on page 67. The author himself must be charged with various Teutonisms, and with slips like *Germanics* for *Germanic* (three times on page 48), *progenerator*, *his habitual habit*. Several sentences are ungrammatical, and many are in sad need of recasting.

BARNARD COLLEGE.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

CORRESPONDENCE

SYNTAX AND TRANSLATION

For the second-year student of Latin, syntax is merely a means to an end. However valuable the study of grammar may be in itself, the Caesar student cares for it only because it holds the key to the Latin sentence. To translate, he must know the relations of the words to one another, and to understand these relations he must give careful attention to the inflectional endings. Once the thought is fully mastered he has no further concern with the

endings and the relations they indicate, just as the man who steps off the top rung of a ladder upon the elevation he seeks has no concern with the ladder. The means are no longer of value when the end has been fully and satisfactorily achieved.

Let me not be misunderstood. I do not mean to deny that there is valuable training in the study of grammar, nor do I mean that when the sentence is once translated the student may safely forget the grammatical principles involved in it. I mean that for the pupil the justification of grammatical knowledge lies and should lie in its availability as a tool.

It follows from these considerations that grammatical distinctions which do not make a difference in the translation should be ignored. For instance, the classification of the genitive as subjective, objective, possessive, etc., is valueless to the high school student for purposes of translation. However classified, the translation of the genitive is the same, and the pupil understands the meaning perfectly without giving a thought to these names. Why distract his attention with these wholly irrelevant details?

Now, if syntax is really a means and not an end in itself, it would seem the part of wisdom for the teacher to lead the pupils to look upon it in this light. He must continually remind them that no one can be sure he understands the thought except as he attends carefully to the word forms and thinks of the relations thereby indicated. These are the essential *preliminary* steps to an understanding of the sentence.

But is this the impression given by a recitation in Latin as usually conducted? On the contrary, it would almost seem as if the teacher desired to give the opposite impression. Instead of emphasizing the fact that an understanding of forms and syntax is the *preliminary* to an understanding of the thought, in an ordinary recitation exactly the opposite is implied. A pupil is called upon to recite. He first of all translates the passage, giving, we will assume, a satisfactory version in acceptable English. Now, no matter how perfect the translation may be, no matter how clear a comprehension of the thought the pupil may evidently have, the teacher next proceeds to an examination of the syntax of the passage, as a subject of independent and later interest. Nay, question and answer in syntax seem often suggested by the translation, as if the latter led up to the former. For instance, if the pupil hesitates in naming a certain ablative construction, the teacher may ask, 'How did you translate it?' and from a consideration of his translation the pupil deduces an ablative of instrument. But surely his translating it as an ablative of instrument, his incorporating it into his English sentence so that it means what the author intended it to mean—this is worth far more than a belated tagging of the construction after he has translated it and therefore has no further use

for it. Certainly a sound pedagogical method would exactly reverse this order. It would make sure first that the pupil has a right understanding of the syntax of the sentence and then ask him, relying on this understanding, to translate it, teaching him that all this preliminary work is of value only as it leads him to a correct and adequate translation.

In my own second-year work I follow this plan: we spend the last few minutes of the recitation period studying the syntax of the morrow's lesson. I read the Latin to them, questioning them as to forms and syntax, impressing it upon them that we are preparing for a translation and that the first question is how the words fit together. It isn't enough to know that a word is in the genitive case: we must find the noun on which it depends. If the verb in an *ut*-clause is in the subjunctive mode, that is important not because it illustrates a rule in the grammar, but because it indicates a different translation from what we should have if the verb were in the indicative. Thus it is constantly drilled into the pupils that they must understand the syntax in order to translate. Questions of construction which cannot be decided offhand are left to be settled by each pupil in his private study, the aim being not to relieve the pupil of work but to train him in correct methods. Next day the pupils translate the lesson, giving their whole attention to the thought and the story, and striving for the best English at their command. I ask no questions about grammar unless the translator has made a mistake due to misapprehension of some grammatical detail, or unless some peculiar usage calls for explanation.

In order further to impress this method upon the pupils, I occasionally give written examinations upon the syntax of previously unseen passages. From these exercises and from the oral work described above, they soon learn that their instinctive impulse to turn immediately to the vocabulary when attacking new Latin may not be wise, since they can make considerable progress toward understanding the passage without looking up a word.

HIGH SCHOOL, Los Angeles. WALTER A. EDWARDS.

In a recent number of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY (5, 20-23) I reviewed certain portions of the new Companion to Latin Studies, and called attention to the fact that Professor J. E. Sandys, the author of the article on Epigraphy, in saying "no specimens of this class (*tesserae hospitales*) have been found" was probably following Professor Egbert, whose Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions is the only book on the subject in English. As a matter of fact two specimens, which are now in European museums, were definitely identified in 1895 after Professor Egbert's book had gone to press. As Professor Egbert made the necessary correction in his revised edition (p. 473) it is all the more surprising that Professor Sandys should still be in need of light on this point.

HARRY L. WILSON.